UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/528,356	03/17/2000	MASAHITO NIIKAWA	15162/01640	6551

24367 7590 06/05/2002

SIDLEY AUSTIN BROWN & WOOD LLP
717 NORTH HARWOOD
SUITE 3400
DALLAS, TX 75201

EXAMINER
TAYLOR, RALPH L

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2673	8

DATE MAILED: 06/05/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/528,356	Applicant(s) NIIKAWA ET AL.	
	Examiner Ralph L Taylor	Art Unit 2673	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *17 March 2000* .

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-27* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-27* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11)☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☒ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) *3,6* .
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: .

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 1, 2, 6, 7, 20, and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Bloch et al. (5,745,102).

In regard to claims 1, 6, and 20, Bloch et al. teaches (column 1, line 64 – column 2, line 14; column 3, lines 49-65; and column 4, lines 49-65: figs. 1, 2A, and 2B) of a driving device (figs. 2A and 2B, item 210) which accepts a storage medium (fig. 1A, item 120) comprising a memory section to be stored with data and a display section (fig. 1A, item 110) to display information and record data to the memory section, said driving device comprising: a receiving section (fig 2 A, slot for medium not labeled) where the storage medium can be set and ejected, the display section of the storage medium being hidden and not being viewable when the storage medium is set in the receiving section; and a driver which records data to the memory section of the storage medium and renews information displayed on the display section of the storage medium in accordance with the data while the storage medium is set in the receiving section. He also teaches (column 11, lines 3-22: figs. 2A, 2B, 7A, and 7B) of an information processing system comprising: a storage medium (fig. 2A and 2B, item 120) which has a memory section to be stored with data and a display section to display information;

and an information processing device (fig. 7A, item 712) where the storage medium is set to be accessed by the information processing device and can be ejected, the display section of the storage medium being hidden and not being viewable while the storage medium is set in the information processing device; wherein the information processing device comprises: a data processing unit (fig. 7A, item 720 or fig. 7B, item 754) which processes data; and a driver which records data processed by the data processing unit to the memory section of the storage medium and renews information on the display section of the storage medium in accordance with the data.

In regard to claims 2,7, and 21, Bloch et al. teaches (column 3, lines 49-65; fig. 1A) of a power supply section (fig. 1A, item 116) which supplies electric power to the display section (fig. 1A, item 110) of the storage medium so that the driver can renew information on the display section.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 3-5, 8-10, and 22-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bloch et al. (5,745,102) and in view of Hatano et al. (5,731,861).

In regard to claims 3-5, 8-10, and 22-24, Bloch et al. does not expressly teach that the display section uses a material with a memory effect nor that the material is liquid crystal which exhibits a cholesteric phase at a room temperature. Hatano et al.

teaches (column 6, lines 12-28; fig. 1) that the display section uses a material with a memory effect (fig. 1, item 3) and that the material is liquid crystal (fig. 1, item 3a) which exhibits a cholesteric phase at a room temperature. At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use a display that utilized a material with memory effect of. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this because for several reasons: no power would have had to be drawn from the power supply (fig. 1, item 116) in the display section of Bloch et al. unless the contents of the display was actually going to be changed, it would have made it possible for the drive circuitry (fig. 1A, item 114) not to contain memory thereby simplifying that circuit, and the power supply wouldn't even have needed to resided with the display section since power could then have been supplied through item 112 of fig. 1A when it was needed. It is also well known in the art that the property of the liquid crystals to possess bi-stable states is a property of cholesteric phase and this is also well known to occur at room temperature.

5. Claims 11-12 and 25-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bloch et al. (5,745,102) as applied to claims 1, 2, 6, 7, 20, and 21 above, and further in view of Sakamaki (6,201,587).

In regard to claims 11-12 and 25-26, Bloch et al. does not expressly teach that the information processing device processes image data nor that the information processing device comprises an image pick-up unit which picks up an image of an object by use of an image sensor and produces image data. Sakamaki teaches (column 8, lines 5-9; fig. 8) that the information processing (fig. 8, item 102) device

processes image data (fig. 8, item 101). He also teaches (column 12, lines 50-53) that the information processing device comprises an image pick-up unit which picks up an image of an object by use of an image sensor and produces image data. At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art that the processing device of Bloch et al. could have processed image data as the device of Sakamaki does since it is well known in the art that a processing device is not limited as to what the data is in order to be able to process it. At the time the invention was made, it would also have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art that a camcorder could be used with the device of Sakamaki, thereby providing a means to input image data.

6. Claims 13, 14, and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bloch et al. (5,745,102) and Sakamaki (6,201,587) as applied to claims 11-12 and 25-26 above, and further in view of Kazami et al. (5,937,107).

In regard to claims 13, 14, and 27, Bloch et al. and Sakamaki together do not expressly teach that the driver records image data to the memory section and writes a thumbnail image of the image data on the display section. Kazami et al. teaches (column 2, lines 49-63; fig. 1) that the driver records image data to the memory section (fig. 1, item 37) and writes a thumbnail image of the image data on the display section (fig. 1, items 28 and 29). At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to stored images in memory and display them on a display. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this because it would have provided a way of looking at several images at once which is

what Kazami et al. intended. At the time the invention was made, it would also have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art that the processor having the ability to store images in memory would also have had the ability to delete the images from memory, as it would have been able to do with any other type data.

7. Claims 15 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Block et al. (5,745,102) as applied to claims 1, 2, 6, 7, 20, and 21 above, and further in view of Houlberg et al. (5,887,198).

In regard to claims 15 and 16, Bloch et al. does not teach that the driver performs formatting of the memory section nor that the driver changes information on the display section in accordance with a format to a piece of information indicating format. Houlberg et al. teaches (column 2, lines 18-21) that the driver performs formatting of the memory section. At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to format the memory section. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this because it is a common practice to format memory in a device so as to except the data in a particular form easily. At the time the invention was made, it would also have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art that in formatting memory, one is usually given an indication on the display that this has occurred.

8. Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bloch et al. (5,745,102) as applied to claims 11-12 and 25-26 above, and further in view of Cannon et al. (5,600,563).

In regard to claim 17, Bloch et al. does not expressly teach that the processing device is a printer. Cannon et al. teaches (column 2, line 65- column 3, line 12) that the processing device is a printer. At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art that there were printers then that did contain processing systems that could read removable data storage devices and both display and print the contents thereof.

9. Claims 18 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bloch et al. (5,745,102) and Cannon et al. (5,600,563) as applied to claim 17 above, and further in view of Tagashira et al. (4,200,390).

In regard to claims 18 and 19, Bloch et al. and Cannon et al. together do not expressly teach that the driver renews information displayed on the display section about a number of prints on completion of printing. Tagashira et al. teaches (column 11, lines 7-19; figs.1 and 2) teach that the driver renews information displayed on the display section (fig.2, item 101a) about a number of prints on completion of printing. At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art that there were printers then that did have displays on them that displayed information about the number of prints printed upon completion of printing.

Responses

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ralph L. Taylor whose telephone number is (703) 305-1391. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8:30 a.m, to 4:00 p.m.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Bipin Shalwala, can be reached at (703) 305-4938.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231 or faxed to:

(703) 872-9314 (for Technology Center 2600 only) Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA, Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

Inquires

11. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Technology Center 2600 Customer Service Office whose telephone number is (703) 306-0377.

Ralph L. Taylor

KENT CHANG
PRIMARY EXAMINER